

The Rotational Structure of Molecules In the Quantum ^4He and ^3He Liquids

V. S. Babichenko and Yu. Kagan

RSC "Kurchatov Institute", Moscow 123182, Russia.

e-mail: babichen@kurm.polyn.kiae.su

It is shown that the drastic distinction in the rotational structure of molecules in the ^4He and ^3He liquids observed in [1] is due to the difference in the spectral density of excitations regardless of the hydrodynamic properties. The large width of rotational levels in the ^3He is determined by particle-hole excitations whereas the small density of phonon excitations results only in the small broadening of levels in the ^4He .

1. In a recent paper [1] a well resolved rotational structure has been observed in the infra-red spectrum of the linear OCS molecule embedded in a ^4He cluster at $T < T_\lambda$. In fact, this group has observed this phenomenon earlier on the example of the SF_6 molecule [2] but with less resolution. However, the most impressive and interesting aspect is the observation in the same work [1] that the rotational structure is completely smeared out in pure ^3He clusters even at lower temperatures. It would be natural to connect these results simply with superfluidity in the ^4He and its lack in the ^3He at the temperature of measurements. However, the hydrodynamic aspect of superfluidity with the corresponding macroscopic kinetic coefficients is not applicable to this problem. This is connected with the fact that the mean free path of excitations in the quantum Bose- and Fermi- liquids under those conditions is large compared with the size of a molecule. However, it is the coupling with the excitations that determines the dissipative picture of the rotational spectrum. The coupling with the ground state of the liquid results in a renormalization of the molecular moment of inertia which is observed in the experiment.

The character and spectral properties of excitations are the specific features of a quantum liquid at low temperatures. The Bose liquid exhibits phonon excitations whereas the Fermi liquid has mainly pair particle-hole excitations. In the following we will show that this distinction in the spectral properties of the excitation branches determines the difference in the width of the rotational levels in these liquids by several orders of the magnitude. This explains the different spectra observed in [1] for these two quantum liquids which differ only in the statistics and have practically the same coupling with the molecule. The connection with superfluidity is due to the fact that the statistics plays the decisive role in the appearance of this unique property.

2. To reveal the principle features of the interaction with the quantum liquids, the molecule is assumed to be a rigid rotator. The Hamiltonian of the interaction in this case can be written in the following form

$$H_{int} = \int d^3\vec{r} U(\vec{r} - \vec{R}) \hat{\rho}(\vec{r}) = \sum_{\vec{k}} U(\vec{k}) \exp(-i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{R}) \hat{\rho}(\vec{k}) \quad (1)$$

Here $\hat{\rho}(\vec{r})$ is the operator of the liquid density, $U(\vec{r} - \vec{R})$ is the potential for the coupling of the rotator with the liquid, and $\vec{R}$ is the coordinate of the rotator

$$\vec{R} = R_0 \vec{n},$$

where $R_0 = \text{const}$, and $\vec{n}$ is the spatial unit vector.

First we suppose that the volume of the liquid is very large. Later on we will consider the role of the finite size of the system.

By assuming the interaction (1) to be weak it is possible to use perturbation theory. The probability of the transition between the rotational levels j_0 and j_1 with simultaneous excitation of the liquid is then given by

$$W_{j_0 j_1} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} |U(\vec{k})|^2 S(\vec{k}, \varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}) \sum_{m_1} \left| \exp(-i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{R}) \right|_{j_0, m_0; j_1, m_1}^2 \quad (2)$$

where $S(\vec{k}, \varepsilon_{j_0 j_1})$ is the dynamic form factor which only depends on the properties of the liquid and is given by

$$S(\vec{k}, \varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{s, s_1} \exp\left(-\frac{E_s}{T}\right) \left| \left(\hat{\rho}(\vec{k}) \right)_{s, s_1} \right|^2 \delta(\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1} - E_{s_1} + E_s) \quad (3)$$

Here s and s_1 denote the states of the liquid which correspond to the energies E_s and E_{s_1} , respectively, and

$$\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1} = \varepsilon_{j_0} - \varepsilon_{j_1}. \quad (4)$$

where ε_j is the energy of the rotator level with the moment j , Z is the partition function. In Eqs. (2) and (3) it is implicitly assumed that the liquid is homogeneous.

3. Let us consider a Bose liquid supposing that $|\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}|, T \ll T_\lambda$. To determine the function S , we employ the known expression connecting density operator of Bose liquid with the creation $\hat{b}_{\vec{k}}^+$ and annihilation $\hat{b}_{\vec{k}}$ phonon operators [3].

$$\hat{\rho}(\vec{r}) = i \sum_{\vec{q}} \left(\frac{\hbar q n}{2m_0 u} \right)^{1/2} \left(\hat{b}_{\vec{q}} \exp(i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{r}) - \hat{b}_{\vec{q}}^+ \exp(-i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{r}) \right) \quad (5)$$

where n is the density of a liquid, u is the velocity of sound and m_0 is the bare mass of the atoms of a Bose liquid. (The volume $V=1$)

After some calculations we find

$$S(\vec{k}, \varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}) = \frac{|\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}| n}{2m_0 u^2} B(\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}; T) \delta(|\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}| - \hbar k u) \quad (6)$$

where

$$B(\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}; T) = (n_B(\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}) + 1) \theta(\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}) + n_B(-\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}) \theta(-\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1})$$

and

$$n_B(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{T}\right) - 1}$$

Under the conditions of the experiment $kR_0 = \frac{|\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}|}{\hbar u} R_0 \ll 1$. This allows us to replace $U(\vec{k})$ by $U(0) \equiv U_0$ in Eq. (2) and to retain only the linear term in $\vec{R}$ for the expansion of exponent. The direct calculation yields

$$\sum_{m_1} \left| \left(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{R} \right)_{j_0, m_0; j_1, m_1} \right|^2 = k^2 R_0^2 f_{j_0 j_1} \quad (7)$$

where the expression for $f_{j_0 j_1}$ has the form

$$f_{j_0 j_1} = \frac{j_0^2}{(2j_0 - 1)(2j_0 + 1)} \quad (\text{if } j_1 = j_0), \quad (8)$$

$$f_{j_0 j_1} = \frac{(j_0 + 1)^2}{(2j_0 + 1)(2j_0 + 3)} \quad (\text{if } j_1 = j_0 + 1).$$

For the $j_0 = 1 \rightarrow j_1 = 0$ transition, the coefficient f_{01} equals $1/3$. Substituting Eqs. (6) and (7) into Eq. (2), we obtain for the transition probability

$$W_{j_0 j_1}^B = |U_0|^2 \frac{n |\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}|^5 R_0^2}{2\pi m_0 u^7 \hbar^6} f_{j_0 j_1} B(\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}; T). \quad (9)$$

4. Let us turn now to the case of the Fermi liquid. We are interested only in the conditions satisfying the inequalities

$$|\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}|, T \ll \varepsilon_F \quad (10)$$

In this case we will employ the Landau theory of the Fermi liquid [3], [4] for the estimate of the transition probability. Within the framework of this theory under the condition Eq. (10) and $1/\tau \ll kV_F$, τ being the typical collision time of excitations, the dynamical form factor Eq. (3) can be written as (see [4])

$$S(\vec{k}, \varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}) = \frac{|\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}|}{2\hbar k v_F} \frac{\nu_F}{(1 + F_0^s)^2} B(\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}; T) \theta(2k_F - k), \quad (11)$$

where the density of states at the Fermi surface ν_F is given by

$$\nu_F = \frac{m^* p_F}{\pi^2 \hbar^3} = \frac{m_0 p_F}{\pi^2 \hbar^3} \left(1 + \frac{F_1^s}{3}\right) \quad (12)$$

Here F_0^s and F_1^s are the dimensionless parameters of the Fermi liquid theory and characterize the interaction between quasiparticles.

In the limit $k_F R_0 \ll 1$ we can use the relations Eq. (7) and Eq. (8). Substituting Eqs. (12) and (7) into Eq. (2) we find

$$W_{j_0 j_1}^F = |U_0|^2 \frac{2|\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}| R_0^2}{\pi^3 \hbar^5} \frac{m^{*2}}{(1 + F_0^s)^2} R_0^2 k_F^4 f_{j_0 j_1} B(\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}; T) \quad (13)$$

In the general case of an arbitrary value of $k_F R_0$ one can employ the expansion

$$\exp(i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{R}) = 4\pi \sum_{l=0} \sum_{m=-l}^l i^l \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2kR_0}} J_{l+1/2}(kR_0) Y_{lm}(\vec{n}) Y_{lm}\left(\frac{\vec{k}}{k}\right)$$

where $J_{l+1/2}$ are the Bessel functions and Y_{lm} are the standard spherical functions.

The dynamical form factor S in Eq. (11) depends only on the modulus $\vec{k}$. That is why the integration over $d\Omega_{\vec{k}}$ conserves only the terms diagonal in l, m in Eq. (2). The calculation of the matrix elements from $Y_{lm}(\vec{n})$ is performed in the standard manner [5]. As a result, with the substitution of $U(\vec{k})$ for U_0 we find for the transition probability

$$W_{j_0 j_1}^F = |U_0|^2 \frac{|\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}| m^{*2}}{2\pi^3 \hbar^5 (1 + F_0^s)^2} B(\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}; T) \sum_{l,m} (2j_0 + 1)(2j_1 + 1)(2l + 1) \times \\ \left(\begin{matrix} j_1 & l & j_0 \\ -m & m - m_0 & m_0 \end{matrix} \right)^2 \left(\begin{matrix} j_1 & l & j_0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{matrix} \right)^2 \int_0^{2k_F} dk k \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2kR_0}} J_{l+1/2}(kR_0) \right)^2 \quad (14)$$

where the symbols $\left(\begin{matrix} j_1 & l & j_0 \\ -m & m - m_0 & m_0 \end{matrix} \right)$ are the standard 3j-symbols [5].

In the opposite limit $k_F R_0 \gg 1$ we have

$$\int_0^{2k_F} dk k \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2kR_0}} J_{l+1/2}(kR_0) \right)^2 = \frac{1}{2R_0^2} \ln(2k_F R_0)$$

To simplify the comparison of the results in the cases of Bose and Fermi liquids, we consider the transition between the levels of $j_0 = 1$ and $j_1 = 0$. In this case Eq. (14) can be simplified and in the $k_F R_0 \gg 1$ limit is given by

$$W_{10}^F = |U_0|^2 \frac{|\varepsilon_{j_0 j_1}| m^{*2}}{4\pi^3 \hbar^5 (1 + F_0^s)^2} \ln(2p_F R_0) B(\varepsilon_{01}; T) \quad (15)$$

5. In order to display the distinctions in the dissipative broadening of the rotational spectrum lines, it is sufficient to compare the probability of transitions between levels with $j_0 = 1$ and $j_1 = 0$ in the both cases. In this case, according to (8), we have $f_{10} = 1/3$. Since the inequality $k_F R_0 > 1$ is more typical, we use Eq. (15) for the Fermi liquid. (For $k_F R_0 \sim 1$, Eqs. (15) and (13) give similar values). Determining the ratio of Eq. (9) to Eq. (15), we have

$$\frac{W_{10}^B}{W_{10}^F} \approx \frac{2\pi^2}{3} (1 + F_0^s)^2 (nR_0^3) \left(\frac{\varepsilon_{01}}{mu^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{m_0}{m^*} \right) \left(\frac{R_0 m_0 u}{\hbar \ln(2k_F R_0)} \right) \quad (16)$$

Taking ^3He and ^4He at zero pressure, one can use the following experimental values of the parameters in Eq. (16) (see, e.g., [6], [5]) for ^3He : $F_0^s = 9.3$, $\frac{m^*}{m_0} = 2.8$, $k_F = 0.8 \times 10^8 \text{cm}^{-1}$, and for ^4He : $n = 2.3 \times 10^{22} \text{1/cm}^3$, $u = 2.4 \times 10 \text{cm/s}$, $m_0 \equiv m_4$. For the OCS molecule [1] the difference in the rotational energies is $\varepsilon_{01} \sim 0.15 \text{cm}^{-1}$, the parameter R_0 is $R_0 \sim 4 \div 5 \text{\AA}$ and with these parameters

$$\frac{W_{10}^B}{W_{10}^F} \sim 10^{-5} \quad (17)$$

Naturally, this is an approximate result. However the ratio is so small that even a more precise calculation cannot change the result that the linewidth in ^3He greatly exceeds the magnitude of the linewidth in ^4He .

6. In connection with these results several remarks are in order. For the Fermi liquid only the dissipative contribution due to particle-hole excitations was taken into account. The Bose excitations, i.e., usual and zero sound, are strongly damped at the intermediate temperatures $T \sim \varepsilon_0 \sim 0.1K$ of the experiment. But even disregarding this fact, the small phase volume characteristic for the Bose excitations predetermines the negligible role of the Bose excitations in the Fermi liquid (just due to the same reason the effect in ^4He is small). Note that this contribution would only further diminish only the ratio Eq. (16).

For the analysis of the transition in the Fermi liquid, we use the classical variant of the Landau theory which assumes that the parameters F_0^s and F_1^s (see Eq. (11) and (12)) are independent of k . The modern theories of the Fermi liquid analyze the effective dependence of these parameters on the momentum $\vec{k}$ [6], [7]. However the fact that the parameters F_0^s and F_1^s decrease within the interval between k_F and $2k_F$ does not change noticeably the estimate (17). Certain growth of F_0^s with the fall of F_1^s within the $0 \div k_F$ interval, predicted in [7], can result in the limited enhancement of the estimate Eq. (17). Another small increase of the ratio Eq. (16) may be associated with the fact that $U(2k_F) < U(0)$.

The renormalization of the moment of inertia J of a molecule in the quantum liquid is connected in decisive degree with the adiabatic reversible coupling. The renormalization of J should be slightly different in the two liquids, although the difference in densities should manifest itself. For the calculation of the ratio in Eq. (16), we used the experimental value of ε_{01} which enters strongly into the value $W_{10}^B \sim (\varepsilon_0)^5$ (Eq.(9)) in ^4He .

Moreover in Eq. (16) identical temperatures were assumed for both liquids. In the ^3He experiments [1] the temperature is about $0.15K$, $T \sim 0.37K$ in the ^4He . Taking into account this fact results in the increase of the ratio Eq. (16) is a factor of about two due to the term $1 + n_B$.

To summary, it is easy to understand that, though the genuine ratio (16) may increase compared with the estimate (17), this ratio remains very small.

All the above results are derived assuming a weak interaction. In fact, this means only that the width of the rotational levels should be small compared with the spacing between the levels. The experimental width of the nonresolved peak in ^3He is about 0.1cm^{-1} , in other words, of the order of ε_0 . This means that only a qualitative comparison with the theoretical estimate is possible. From the experimental point of view it would be to have measurements at various temperatures also above T_λ . From the theoretical point of view it is interesting to consider the problem for the case of the strong interaction when the motion of a molecule in the angular space has the purely diffusive character. The corresponding analysis will be published elsewhere.

7. So far we have considered the molecule to be embedded inside bulk helium. In the case of a cluster of finite size L the results obtained for the Fermi liquid require that the weak condition $k_F L \gg 1$ is fulfilled. This is due to the fact that $k \sim k_F$ for the excitations characteristic for the problem. In the case of a Bose liquid the requirement is much stronger $\frac{\varepsilon_{01}}{\hbar u} L \gg 1$. For the opposite inequality there are no phonons in the system for which the conservation energy law can be satisfied in Eq. (6). In this case the interaction with the surface excitations, for which the wave function penetrates effectively in the depth of a cluster, becomes significant. This interesting problem will be considered separately.

REFERENCES

- [1] S.Grebenev, J.P.Toennies, and A.F.Vilesov, Science 279, (1998), 2083.

- [2] M.Harmann, R.E.Miller, J.P.Toennies, and A.Vilesov, Phys.Rev.Lett. 75, (1995),1566.
- [3] E.M.Lifshitz and L.P.Pitaevskii, "Statistical Physics" , (Pergamon, Oxford, 1980).
- [4] D.Pines and P.Nozieres, "The Theory of Quantum Liquids", (Benjamin, New York, 1966).
- [5] L.D.Landau and E.M.Lifshitz, "Quantum Mechanics", (Pergamon, Oxford, 1978).
- [6] D.Vollhardt and P.Wolfe, "The Superfluid Phases of Helium 3" (Taylor and Francis, London, 1990).
- [7] M.Pfitzner and P.Wolfe, Phys.Rev. B35, (1987), 4699.